United Nations A/65/702–S/2011/46

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
1 February 2011

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixty-fifth session
Agenda item 43
Question of Cyprus

Security Council
Sixty-sixth year

Letter dated 25 January 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 21 January 2011, addressed to you by Hilmi Akil, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly under agenda item 43, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Ertuğrul **Apakan**
Permanent Representative

11-22189 (E) 030211

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 25 January 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to convey herewith a copy of the letter dated 21 January 2011 addressed to you by Hüseyin Özgürgün, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see enclosure).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 43, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Hilmi **Akil**
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

Enclosure

It has come to my attention that the Greek Cypriot administration, which purports to be the "Government of the Republic of Cyprus" and the State of Israel have signed an agreement on the delimitation of the exclusive economic zone, on 17 December 2010 (see attachment). In this connection, I would like to bring the following to your kind attention.

It should be stated, at the outset, that the "Government of the Republic of Cyprus" has no legal or moral right or the jurisdiction to represent or act on behalf of the whole island or the Turkish Cypriot people whose sole legitimate representatives are those elected by the Turkish Cypriot people. The separate simultaneous referendums on the Comprehensive Settlement Plan conducted on 24 April 2004 further confirmed that there exist two equal peoples on the island, neither of which represents the other.

It would be untenable to claim that there is a single authority representing both peoples of the island, as any decision on the future of Cyprus, including a solution, clearly requires the consent of both sides and peoples. Moreover, the absence of a political settlement in Cyprus cannot justify the illegal Greek Cypriot claim to be the government of the "Republic of Cyprus" when it is, in fact, the Greek Cypriot side itself that dismantled the Constitution, violated international agreements and wrecked the binational set up, as a result of which an exclusively Greek Cypriot administration came into being. The Greek Cypriot side's unilateral activities regarding delimitation of maritime jurisdiction areas in the Eastern Mediterranean, before a comprehensive settlement on the island, undermine the fundamental rights and interests of the Turkish Cypriot people. It should be remembered that the Greek Cypriot administration had concluded similar agreements with Lebanon and Egypt which were objected to by the Turkish Cypriot side for the very reasons mentioned above.

There is no doubt that the Turkish Cypriot people, who were the co-founding partner in the 1960 Republic of Cyprus, have equal rights and jurisdiction on the natural resources of the island and the sea areas of Cyprus. Moreover, it is an established understanding in the negotiations, including the current process, that issues related to the delimitation of maritime jurisdiction areas of the island of Cyprus have been left to the discretion of the new partnership government, where Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots will have an equal say.

The attempts of the Greek Cypriot administration to create a fait accompli in the Eastern Mediterranean through unilateral acts, such as negotiating and concluding agreements as regards the delimitation of the sea areas of Cyprus, continue to undermine stability in the Eastern Mediterranean region as a whole.

In view of the foregoing, the agreement signed by the Greek Cypriot administration under its purported capacity as the "Government of the Republic of Cyprus" is null and void and is not, in any way, binding on the Turkish Cypriot people or the island as a whole.

In concluding, I would like to reiterate our firm commitment to a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem under your mission of good offices as well as the long-established United Nations framework and parameters. You clearly stated in your latest mission of good offices report dated 24 November 2010

(S/2010/603) that "the latest talks cannot be an open-ended process" and that "a critical window of opportunity is rapidly closing". Thus, we expect that the Greek Cypriot leadership finally focuses on the negotiating process and refrains from taking unilateral steps, which are detrimental to the efforts aimed at a comprehensive settlement.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 43, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Hüseyin **Özgürgün**
Minister of Foreign Affairs

Attachment

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
TERM: VII
YEAR: 3

DATE: 27 December 2010

DECISION NO: 106/3/2010
THE DECISION CONDEMNING THE AGREEMENT ON THE DELIMITATION OF THE EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONES SIGNED BETWEEN THE GREEK CYPRIOT ADMINISTRATION AND ISRAEL

The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus Legislative Assembly;

On 17 December 2010, the Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus and Israel has signed an agreement delimiting the Exclusive Economic Zone in the Eastern Mediterranean. The agreement, aimed at exploiting natural gas and oil in the area, concluded in the absence of a settlement in Cyprus, is a unilateral agreement signed by the Greek Cypriot administration purporting to act on behalf of Cyprus and is legally and politically null and void as it only protects the rights of the Greek Cypriot people and ignores the fundamental rights and interests of the Turkish Cypriot people.

The partnership rights deriving from the Republic of Cyprus which was established as a partnership state in 1960 on the basis of the treaties of Establishment, Guarantee and of Alliance, have been unilaterally usurped by the Greek Cypriot Administration since 1963. This agreement, concluded on the basis of the Greek Cypriot understanding and its usurpation, is unacceptable.

The agreement signed between Israel and the Greek Cypriot Administration relates to issues which are subject to negotiations currently underway between the two leaders under the auspices of the United Nations. The said agreement is detrimental to the ongoing negotiating process as well as the Geneva meeting organized by the United Nations which will take place under the auspices of the United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon between 25-26 January 2011.

This unilateral initiative taken by the Greek Cypriots affects Turkey, a guarantor state under the 1960 Treaties of Guarantee and of Alliance, as well as the neighboring countries Syria, Lebanon and Egypt in terms of the principles of fairness and increases the political tension. Such an agreement will further aggravate the negative atmosphere prevailing in the island and undermine the efforts aimed at finding a settlement to the Cyprus problem. Such an economic asset should be taken up in a manner strengthening peace and cooperation rather than causing a conflict of interests between the two sides in Cyprus. This will contribute to an understanding which will bring peace and stability not only to Cyprus but the region as a whole.

In this regard, all the initiatives taken by the Greek Cypriot side in Eastern Mediterranean result in new and multi-dimensional political tensions and this in turn poses important potential risks for the region.

We condemn this and similar steps taken by the Greek Cypriot Administration and deem them unacceptable.

United Nations A/65/708–S/2011/47

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
1 February 2011
English
Original: Arabic

General Assembly
Sixty-fifth session
Agenda item 36
The situation in the Middle East

Security Council
Sixty-sixth year

Identical letters dated 26 January 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the position of Lebanon, in preparation for the comprehensive assessment that the Secretary-General will present in his forthcoming report on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1701 (2006) (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter issued as an official document of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 36, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Nawaf **Salam**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

11-22290 (E) 030211 070211

Please recycle

Annex to the identical letters dated 26 January 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

Position of Lebanon in preparation for the comprehensive assessment that will be presented by the Secretary-General in his forthcoming report on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1701 (2006)

In preparation for the comprehensive periodic assessment that will be presented by the Secretary-General in his forthcoming report on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1701 (2006), Lebanon would like to note that ever since that resolution was adopted, it has devoted itself to the presentation of a paper that expresses its position with respect to the comprehensive assessment of the Secretary-General. Lebanon believes that from the day resolution 1701 (2006) was adopted, Israel has failed to honour its obligation to implement it or to withdraw from all occupied Lebanese territory, and has persisted in violating Lebanese sovereignty, thereby ensuring that no progress has been made in the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006) with respect to obliging Israel to withdraw from all Lebanese territory and cease its infractions. Lebanon would like to draw attention to the following:

1. Lebanon reiterates its commitment to the full implementation of resolution 1701 (2006) and calls on the international community to bring pressure to bear on Israel to fulfil its obligation to implement that resolution in full; and exert greater, serious, efforts to achieve a permanent ceasefire.

2. Since the last assessment, the Israeli enemy army has continued to violate Lebanese sovereignty in contravention of the provisions of resolution 1701 (2006). Those violations included the following:

(a) During the reporting period, the Israeli enemy army continued to violate Lebanese airspace, territory and territorial waters, committing 298 air violations, 24 sea violations and 149 land violations, in flagrant violation of Lebanese sovereignty and the provisions of resolution 1701 (2006), which calls for full respect for the Blue Line. Lebanon demands the immediate cessation of such violations.

Lebanon affirms that the some 7,817 air, sea and land violations of the Blue Line and Lebanese sovereignty committed by Israel since the adoption of resolution 1701 (2006) constitute a flagrant violation of the aforementioned resolution and all other relevant United Nations resolutions, the most important of which is resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978. Between the Israeli onslaught on Lebanon in 2006 and February 2010 there were between three and four Israeli violations per day. Since March 2010 the daily average to date is 11 violations, in addition to repeated Israeli threats to destroy the infrastructure of Lebanon.

Those violations threaten international peace and security and constitute a flagrant violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Lebanon calls upon the international community to bring pressure to bear

on Israel and oblige it to cease its daily violations of Lebanese sovereignty and to respect the international resolutions adopted by the United Nations.

(b) Lebanon reminds the international community yet again that Israel is seeking to undermine resolution 1701 (2006) by every means possible. On 7 December 2009, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu declared that resolution 1701 (2006) had collapsed.

(c) The networks of spies that were recruited by the Israeli enemy constitute a blatant aggression against Lebanon, an attack on its sovereignty and a flagrant violation thereof that contravenes international resolutions and, in particular, Security Council resolution 1701 (2006). More than 140 collaborators were recruited by Israel in order to assist its intelligence apparatus, and were under orders to undertake sabotage operations both within and beyond the areas of Lebanon in which the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) is deployed. Those spy networks threatened national security by infiltrating Lebanese society and civil and military institutions through the recruitment of collaborators to work in the interests of Israeli intelligence. Those collaborators were ordered to undertake sabotage operations that included the detonation of explosives, the assassination of prominent Lebanese citizens, terrorist activities and attacks on Lebanese infrastructure. The networks, by using the collaborators to gain control over Lebanese land and mobile communications and eavesdrop on Lebanese citizens, also constituted an infringement of the security of communications in Lebanon that continues to this day, given that those collaborators provided Israel with the frequencies and passwords for the services of mobile telephone providers and their base transceiver stations, in addition to providing precise, in-depth studies on the operational procedures of mobile stations. Lebanon lodged a complaint with the Security Council with regard to the spy networks that were cultivated in Lebanon by Israel, in which it detailed some of the sabotage operations that they carried out on the direct orders of the Israeli intelligence services. That complaint was issued as an official document of the Security Council and the General Assembly (A/64/908-S/2010/460).

(d) On Friday, 3 December 2010, at 11.40 a.m., Israeli enemy forces detonated by remote control listening devices that they had planted in Lebanese territory at Wadi Qaysiyah on the outskirts of Majdal Silm in the Marj Uyun district opposite the Abbad position in South Lebanon. The detonation was carried out after Lebanese workers had discovered the Israeli listening devices while digging at that location with an excavator. The detonation caused multiple injuries to Hussein Shahadah and his brother Hassan Shahadah, both of whom had to be taken to hospital for treatment. The planting of listening devices in Lebanese territory by Israeli enemy forces is a blatant violation of Lebanese sovereignty, international law and Security Council resolution 1701 (2006), and affirms yet again Israel's disdain for international resolutions; its determination to pursue aggressive and provocative policies towards Lebanon; and the threat that Israel persistently poses to international peace and security.

(e) On 15 December 2010, the technical divisions of the Lebanese Armed Forces inspected and dismantled an electronic device camouflaged as a rock that had been planted by Israeli enemy forces on a cliff some 1,715 metres above sea level in a rugged mountainous area between Jabal Baruk and Tallat Tumat Niha in the Lebanese Shuf that overlooks most of the towns in the Western and central

Bekaa, and from which Syria and many of the towns in southern Lebanon, as far as the borders with Palestine, may be seen. Field investigations carried out by the Lebanese Army discovered two artificial rocks that had been planted in the aforementioned area, each of which was around one cubic metre in size. The first concealed an electronic communications transmitter and receiver device, while the second contained a large number of panels to provide energy for the device in the first rock. The device had seven directive antennas, which were employed as follows: five were directed towards Ruwaysat al-Alam in occupied Palestinian territory, while the other two were directed towards the villages of the Western Bekaa, on a line beginning at the rock, and passing through Lala towards Masna` on the Lebanese-Syrian borders. Inside the electronic device were a number of electronic components for transmitting and receiving, some of which were made in the United States of America, while others were manufactured by Israeli companies. Markings in both Hebrew and English clearly showed that their origin was Israeli. It was evident to the Lebanese Army that the purpose of the device was to effect communication between sites inside Lebanese territory and the Israeli position at Ruwaysat al-Alam, where there are numerous communications and eavesdropping stations.

The technical divisions of the Lebanese Armed Forces also detected and dismantled a second system which the Israeli forces had planted on the heights of `Arid al-Tuwaihan on Jabal Sannin, in a very rugged mountainous area some 2,500 metres above sea level. That device, which was extremely well concealed, was a cylindrical camera hidden in a grey imitation rock made of fibreglass. A second rock, found some 1.5 metres south of the first, was a transmitting and receiving device. The system was powered by three plastic battery packs that were reinforced in order to withstand both atmospheric conditions and heavy weights. Both items were buried in the ground and connected in such a way as to ensure that they would continue to function for a lengthy period.

The second device comprised the following components:

- The optic system: this consisted of a sophisticated device for long-distance surveillance which comprised two cameras, one for daylight use and the other with infrared night vision, and a laser device to determine distances and/or coordinates. The device had a complicated and sophisticated mechanical operating system and was linked to its operators by wireless apparatus that governs and operates it and transmits information and pictures.
- Picture transmission apparatus: comprising a device for transmitting pictures and a patch antenna.
- A system for receiving control signals.
- The system control circuit.
- The power system.

The planting by Israel of those two systems deep within Lebanese territory constitutes a flagrant violation of Lebanese sovereignty, international laws and norms, and Security Council resolution 1701 (2006), and is prejudicial to international peace and security. It also constitutes an act of aggression against Lebanese territory and confirms yet again Israel's contempt for United Nations resolutions. Lebanon demands that the Security Council assume its responsibility to

maintain international peace and security and bring pressure to bear on Israel to abandon its aggressive and provocative policies towards Lebanon. The Council should also ensure that Israel complies with resolution 1701 (2006) and withdraws forthwith, unconditionally, from all Lebanese territory.

(f) UNIFIL continues to exert every possible effort to ensure that Israeli forces withdraw completely from the area known as 14B, which is the Lebanese part of the village of Ghajar and the uninhabited adjacent area, and the Lebanese Government is continuing to cooperate with UNIFIL with a view to achieving that aim. Notwithstanding those efforts, the Israeli army continues to occupy the aforementioned area, in flagrant violation of its obligations under Security Council resolution 1701 (2006), which provides that Israel must withdraw immediately and unconditionally from the village of Ghajar. Israel's procrastination with regard to withdrawal from the area known as 14B compels us to question the sincerity of Israel's commitment to implementation of that resolution and the extent to which the Security Council is capable of obliging that country to end its occupation. It is incumbent upon the international community to take action to ensure that Israel completely withdraws from the Lebanese part of the village of Ghajar and area 14B as soon as possible. The Israeli Government is attempting to prevaricate, regardless of the fact that such withdrawal does not constitute a concession, but is one of the key requirements of Security Council resolution 1701 (2006).

(g) Lebanon believes that the continued occupation by Israel of the Lebanese Shab'a Farms and Kafr Shuba hills constitutes a threat to stability and security. Lebanon requests the international community to bring pressure to bear on Israel to completely and unconditionally withdraw from all Lebanese territory, and urges the Secretary-General of the United Nations to intensify his efforts to ensure that Israel withdraws from that territory. Lebanon reminds the international community that, under the provisions of the relevant Security Council resolutions, Israel is obliged to withdraw from the Shab'a Farms and Kafr Shuba hills.

(h) Lebanon would like to bring to the attention of the international community yet again the fact that the maps relating to cluster bombs that Lebanon has received from Israel are incomplete and imprecise. Israel dropped those bombs randomly on densely populated civilian areas, thereby causing the death or injury of more than 400 persons, including 47 fatalities and 353 cases of severe and disabling injury. It should once more be underlined that the Government of Lebanon had its doubts about the precision of the maps that it received from Israel, and demands that information should be deposited regarding the dates on which the cluster bombs that were used during the Israeli raids were dropped, together with the quantity and type of those bombs. It should also once again be stressed that the Lebanese Army has asked for aerial photographs or video pictures of the targeted areas before and after the bombardments. Israel bears entire responsibility and should pay compensation for the deaths of numerous Lebanese citizens that have been caused by the cluster bombs and unexploded ammunition that were dropped by Israel during its onslaught on Lebanon, and for the numerous crimes that Israel has committed against Lebanon and its population. Lebanon urges the United Nations and donor countries to continue to address that issue, in order to protect the lives of innocent civilians, and to call for the Lebanon Mine Action Centre to be granted the necessary financial resources to enable it to carry out its mandate.

(i) The Israeli army has continued to use launches to conduct illegal patrols inside Lebanese territorial waters close to the so-called "line of buoys" that was positioned unilaterally and illicitly inside those waters. Israel makes the fraudulent claim that those buoys approximate the southern border of Lebanese territorial waters. The Israeli army has also continued to fire warning shots and launch grenades at Lebanese fishing boats. Furthermore, it regularly detonates explosive charges close to the aforementioned line, inside Lebanese territorial waters. In the twelfth report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1701 (2006) (S/2010/105), paragraph 29, the Secretary-General warned that those Israeli measures contribute to increasing tension between the parties. Lebanon does not recognize any line that has been put in place unilaterally, and considers that the Israeli measures are a further violation of Lebanese sovereignty and Security Council resolution 1701 (2006). Lebanon requests the United Nations to authorize UNIFIL to put in position in the region a line of buoys that is in keeping with international standards.

(j) On 9 July 2010, Lebanon deposited with the United Nations a map on which the southern maritime border with occupied Palestine is clearly marked, together with the exclusive economic zone of Lebanon. The geographical coordinates of the borders, which were set forth in accordance with international standards, are specified. On 11 October 2010, Lebanon also deposited with the United Nations two maps designating the south-western maritime borders of the aforementioned economic zone, together with two tables in which are set forth the geographical coordinates of those borders.

3. The Lebanese Army is continuing to strengthen field and strategic cooperation with UNIFIL.

(a) The coordination between the Lebanese Army and UNIFIL is particularly evident in their joint patrols, joint checkpoints and joint military training operations and exercises.

(b) Lebanon stresses the fact that none of the reports of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1701 (2006) has made any reference to indications that weapons are smuggled into the UNIFIL area of operations. All weapons that have been seized are remnants of the war waged against Lebanon by Israel in the summer of 2006. Lebanon further stresses once again that the Lebanese Army and the Lebanese security apparatus have not reported any incidence of weapon smuggling since the most recent report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1701 (2006) was submitted to the Security Council.

(c) Israel's claim that weapons are being stockpiled and military installations established in densely populated civilian areas in South Lebanon bears no relation to the truth, and is designed to facilitate the targeting by Israel of innocent Lebanese civilians and justify their slaughter and terrorization, regardless of the fact that all international instruments and, in particular, those of international humanitarian law, outlaw and criminalize the targeting of civilians.

(d) Lebanon continues to participate in tripartite meetings that are held with a view to maintaining peace along the Blue Line. Those meetings are the appropriate place in which to address issues pending from resolution 1701 (2006) and flashpoints along the aforementioned Line. Israel's persistence in resorting to

unilateral measures undermines those tripartite meetings and the role of UNIFIL in maintaining the peace in its area of operations. Furthermore, those unilateral measures are intended to raise doubt as to the capacity of the Lebanese armed forces to defend the sovereignty of all Lebanese territory, contrary to the spirit of resolution 1701 (2006).

(c) With respect to the positioning of markers along the Blue Line, Lebanon affirms yet again the agreement that was reached at the tripartite meeting with a view to making progress in and accelerating that operation. Israeli procrastination in that regard raises doubts as to its real intentions.

4. Lebanon stresses the importance of strengthening and raising the level of international assistance in building the capacities of the Lebanese Army and security forces and preparing them to perform their duty to defend Lebanese sovereignty and protect the Lebanese people. The Lebanese Army needs reinforcements of arms and ammunition and to acquire more modern means of surveillance and up-to-date communications equipment. It also requires training in the use of all such equipment and apparatus.

5. Notwithstanding the limited capacities and resources of the Lebanese Army, the Government of Lebanon has decided to deploy two additional battalions south of the Litani river, in order to further demonstrate its commitment to the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006).

6. At the economic level, we once more support the call that is made to the international community in resolution 1701 (2006) to extend more of the assistance that is necessary for the reconstruction and development of Lebanon. In that connection, we urge States that took part in the Stockholm Conference, Paris III and the Vienna Conference to honour their commitments. Lebanon greatly appreciates all economic and social programmes and humanitarian assistance that UNIFIL provides to the Lebanese people in its area of operations, including projects that have an immediate impact and emergency medical services.

United Nations A/65/709–S/2011/48

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
1 February 2011
English
Original: Arabic

General Assembly
Sixty-fifth session
Agenda item 36
The situation in the Middle East

Security Council
Sixty-sixth year

Identical letters dated 28 January 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, I attach herewith a letter containing a complaint against the enemy Israeli forces, which abducted a Lebanese citizen from within Lebanese territory on 18 January 2011 (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated as a document of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 36, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Nawaf **Salam**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

11-22284 (E) 020211 040211

Please recycle

Annex to the identical letters dated 28 January 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

On 18 January 2011, an Israeli enemy patrol crossed the technical fence and the Blue Line, entering Lebanese territory and lying in ambush at a location six metres north of the Blue Line, on the outskirts of the Lebanese town of Rumaysh. The ambush resulted in the abduction of a Lebanese citizen, Shirbil al-Khuri, whom the Israeli enemy forces proceeded to take into occupied Palestinian territory. That action represents a flagrant violation of Lebanese sovereignty, Security Council resolution 1701 (2006), international law and the Charter of the United Nations, and affirms yet again Israel's contempt for international resolutions and its determination to continue to pursue its aggressive and provocative policies and to continually threaten international peace and security. Lebanon has repeatedly complained of the continual abductions that are carried out by Israeli enemy forces of helpless Lebanese civilians who are beaten and subjected to mental and physical injury, thereby affirming Israel's determination to pursue a policy of aggression against Lebanon. Lebanon demands that the Security Council should fulfil its responsibilities and take appropriate measures to prevail upon Israel to cease its daily violations of Lebanese sovereignty, abandon its aggressive policy towards Lebanese citizens and withdraw from all Lebanese territory in accordance with Security Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 1701 (2006).

United Nations S/2011/49

Security Council

Distr.: General
3 February 2011

Original: English

Identical letters dated 1 February 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

I write to express my serious concern in the light of continued terrorist attacks emanating from the Gaza Strip.

Yesterday, 31 January 2011, three long-range rockets — including two Grad-type rockets — were launched from the Gaza Strip, exploding in southern Israel near the cities of Netivot and Ofakim and in the area of Eshkol. One of these rockets landed in the immediate vicinity of the site of a wedding celebration — fortunately, none of the many civilians nearby were injured in this explosion.

These attacks continue a disturbing trend; over the past month, we have witnessed the launch of some 15 rockets and 17 mortars from Gaza into southern Israel. Many of these rockets have exploded in the heart of civilian population centres, including numerous attacks on the City of Ashkelon — which is home to more than 100,000 people — and an attack on 8 January 2011 on Kibbutz Nahal Oz, which injured three agricultural workers.

As I highlighted in previous letters, these attacks constitute a clear violation of international law and must be addressed with the utmost seriousness. While Israel has taken a series of measures to improve life for the inhabitants of Gaza, terrorist organizations continue to operate in the area and attack Israeli civilians with impunity.

With a view to preventing further conflict in our region, Israel expects the Security Council, the Secretary-General, and the international community to firmly condemn all of these attacks.

Israel holds the terrorist entity in de facto control of Gaza fully responsible for all terrorist attacks emanating from the area. In response to these attacks, Israel will continue to exercise its right to self-defence, as appropriate, and will take all necessary measures to protect its citizens.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter distributed as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Meron **Reuben**
Ambassador
Permanent Mission of Israel to the United Nations

11-22418 (E) 040211

Please recycle

United Nations S/2011/50

Security Council

Distr.: General
2 February 2011

Original: English

Letter dated 2 February 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to inform you that, under the presidency of Brazil, the Security Council is scheduled to hold an open debate on the subject of "Maintenance of international peace and security: the interdependence between security and development" on Friday, 11 February 2011. In order to help steer the discussions on the subject, Brazil has prepared the attached concept note (see annex).

I would be grateful if the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the Security Council in connection with the item entitled "Maintenance of international peace and security".

(*Signed*) Maria Luiza **Ribeiro Viotti**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations

11-22323 (E) 030211

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 2 February 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Interdependence between security and development

Introduction

Since the late 1990s, the Security Council has displayed a growing awareness of the interdependence between security and development. It has time and again recognized the need to take both elements into account in the exercise of its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security. Far too often history has shown that purely military engagement in conflict situations — particularly in intra-State conflicts with international implications — is unlikely to bring about a quality of peace that can be sustained in the medium and long term. If the Security Council is to be effective, sustainable peace must be achieved.

The United Nations experience in conflict situations has demonstrated that sustainable peace requires a comprehensive approach to security — which involves consideration of the root causes of violence, as well as of the social and economic situation on the ground. What remains subject to discussion among Security Council members is how much of this consideration lies within the purview of the Council and how far peacekeeping operations should be involved in such efforts.

The Security Council debate on the interdependence between security and development now proposed by Brazil offers an opportunity to advance the already intense international dialogue on this issue. It intends to build on the conclusions reached by relevant discussions, such as those promoted last year by France in February on transition and exit strategies (S/PRST/2010/2); by Japan in April on a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy to prevent the recurrence of conflict (S/PRST/2010/7); by Turkey in September on ensuring the Security Council's effective role in maintaining international peace and security (S/PRST/2010/18); by Uganda in October on post-conflict peacebuilding (S/PRST/2010/20); and by Bosnia and Herzegovina, during its presidency in January of this year on post-conflict peacebuilding: institution-building (S/PRST/2011/2).

Security and development: a complex relationship

Not all peoples suffering from poverty resort to violence, but social, political and economic exclusion can contribute to the eruption or protraction of or relapse into violence and conflict. This seems to be the case in situations as different as those of Haiti or of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. A professional and accountable security sector may, for instance, foster stability and the rule of law. That should not, however, be considered an end in itself. Stability must be sought as a means to enhance social and economic development — which is, for instance, clearly the most appropriate approach for a situation such as that of Guinea-Bissau.

The Security Council has underlined the necessity to address the root causes of conflicts, taking into account that development, peace and security and human rights are interlinked and mutually reinforcing (S/PRST/2010/18). With this in mind, a number of key issues in conflict and post-conflict situations need to be dealt with from the perspectives of both security and development. The relative abundance of

natural resources, for instance, can either accelerate development or fuel conflict. Addressing only one of these aspects will offer an incomplete picture.

Peacebuilding has emerged as the primary tool for bridging the gap between security and development. As early as 2001, the Security Council noted the need for enhancing peacebuilding activities by formulating a strategy based on the interdependence between sustainable peace, security and development in all its dimensions (S/PRST/2001/5). Ten years later, such a strategy is still lacking in spite of many positive steps, including the establishment of a dedicated United Nations architecture for peacebuilding activities.

The Security Council has also recognized that responding to challenges of conflicts in most instances requires a coherent and integrated mix of peacebuilding and peacekeeping activities, including political, military, civilian, humanitarian and development activities (S/PRST/2005/20). Such a mix of peacebuilding and peacekeeping activities requires sufficient consideration, by the Security Council, of peacebuilding activities on a case-by-case basis and from its early engagement with a country.

The successful implementation by peacekeepers of many of their commonly mandated tasks, such as support for security sector reform and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes, is closely linked to the existence of economic opportunity. On a more strategic level, progress in the area of development can help foster a greater commitment to stability on the part of the local population. Generating this interest in stability is crucial to achieving conditions for sustainable peace and allowing for the subsequent drawdown of a peacekeeping mission.

Where appropriate, the Security Council should ensure that early peacebuilding activities are implemented by peacekeeping operations or carried out with their support, while other bodies of the United Nations and partners of host countries engage in broader peacebuilding and development issues.

The relevance of the interdependence between security and development for the work of the Security Council

In the light of the preceding considerations, it seems clear that development issues are relevant to the Council in discharging its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. This relevance was initially identified in 1997 with regard to African issues on the agenda. Meeting at the level of Foreign Ministers, the Security Council adopted a presidential statement (S/PRST/1997/46), in which it considered that the challenges of Africa demanded a more comprehensive response and requested the Secretary-General to present a report containing concrete recommendations to the Council regarding the sources of conflict in Africa, ways to prevent and address these conflicts, and how to lay the foundation for durable peace and economic growth following their resolution. The Secretary-General's 1998 report on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa (A/52/871-S/1998/318) was to become a landmark document addressing the nexus between peace and security and development.

The existence of such a nexus does not mean that the Security Council should take on responsibilities of other principal organs of the United Nations, such as the

General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, or create overlaps with the Peacebuilding Commission or United Nations agencies, funds and programmes. These should, of course, continue to exert their respective jurisdictions over development issues. It does, however, imply that the Security Council must take into account social and development issues in its deliberations in order to ensure an effective transition to peace.

In some conflict and post-conflict situations, the Security Council may determine that certain socio-economic issues constitute a threat to international peace and security in their own right. In other cases, it may determine what early peacebuilding tasks can be performed by peacekeepers when they are deployed. The Council may also consider where peacekeepers can take on the role of enablers in relation to other agents and actors.

Moreover, given that the support for conflict-affected countries in their journey towards peace and prosperity must be a system-wide commitment by the United Nations, the Council has a legitimate interest in the effectiveness of development actors on the ground and in their coordination with Security Council-mandated missions, where they are deployed. A well-executed, integrated strategy on the part of the agencies, funds and programmes and the international financial institutions can significantly increase the prospects for success of the Council's efforts to ensure peace and security (including by increasing the local population's stake in stability and making them less likely to support or join rebel groups).

The Council may therefore wish to take a number of actions within the limits of its responsibilities under the Charter, such as:

- Drawing attention to the security implications of development-related issues (either through its formal documents or through informal dialogues with other actors).
- Conveying to the Secretary-General its concern with development aspects that may trigger violence, such as youth unemployment, or aggravate situations of conflict, and requesting information on it.
- Requiring the Peacebuilding Commission to provide advice on non-security areas that may nonetheless have a significant impact on security matters, thus enabling the adoption of a wider perspective.
- Calling on Member States to promote coherence in the work of the United Nations in conflict and post-conflict situations through their participation in executive boards and governance structures of the agencies, funds and programmes.

The way forward

In their consideration of the matter, Member States are encouraged to examine recent reports and non-papers such as the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (A/64/868-S/2010/393, annex); the report on the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa (A/65/152-S/2010/526); the concept note for the forthcoming *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development*; the non-papers prepared by the Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field

Support "A new partnership agenda: charting a new horizon for UN peacekeeping" and "Peacekeeping and peacebuilding: clarifying the nexus"; the Turkish presidency's concept paper on "Ensuring the Security Council's effective role in maintaining international peace and security" (S/2010/461); and the summaries of the General Assembly's thematic debate on peacekeeping and of the seminars held in Portugal (A/64/871-S/2010/397) and Brazil (A/64/907). Member States may wish to reflect on the following questions in their interventions:

- How can Security Council-mandated missions better contribute to sustainable peace? Which peace dividends are more relevant to securing local support and a virtuous cycle of stability in a country emerging from conflict?
- What capacity do United Nations missions need to have in order to contribute to improved coordination and synergies among all actors with a stake in sustainable peace, including local authorities and civil society?
- How can peacekeeping missions help development actors in enabling an environment conducive to the protection of civilians in the short and long term?
- How can enhanced integration of the security and development dimensions of post-conflict situations — such as in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes and peacebuilding activities — result in greater social and economic inclusion of women and the promotion of women's rights?
- What role can the Council play in helping to address the role of natural resources in fuelling conflicts?
- In which areas will increased coordination with development actors allow peacekeepers to better fulfil peacebuilding-related mandates?
- How can the Council, within its institutional framework, establish a strategic dialogue with the Peacebuilding Commission, and, through it, with the World Bank and other development actors on specific situations of concern?
- Could the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa and its comprehensive review be built upon as a reference for a global study on the interdependence between security and development?
- How could reports of the Secretary-General be improved in terms of conflict analysis, including sufficient contextual information on the root causes of conflict and on development issues to enable the Council to make informed decisions on security matters?

United Nations A/65/692* S/2011/51

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
21 January 2011

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixty-fifth session
Agenda items 36 and 37

Security Council
Sixty-sixth year

The situation in the Middle East

Question of Palestine

Letter dated 13 January 2011 from the Chargé d' affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Guyana to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to inform you that the Government of Guyana has decided to formally recognize the State of Palestine. Transmitted herewith is the statement issued on 13 January by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Guyana informing of the decision (see annex).

It would be appreciated if the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 36 and 37, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) George **Talbot**
Chargé d' affaires a.i.

* Document A/65/692 reissued for technical reasons on 3 February 2011 under the symbol A/65/692-S/2011/51.

11-21383* (E) 030211

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 13 January 2011 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Guyana to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Statement by the Government of Guyana in recognition of the State of Palestine

13 January 2011

The Government of Guyana has today decided to formally recognize the State of Palestine as a free, independent, and sovereign State, based on its 1967 borders.

This decision is in keeping with Guyana's long-standing and unwavering solidarity with, and commitment to, the just and legitimate aspirations of the people of Palestine for the exercise of their right to self-determination and to achieve a homeland of their own, independent, free, prosperous and at peace, and our advocacy over the years for a two-State solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict with the people of Israel and Palestine living side by side in their free and independent countries in peace, prosperity and harmony and within secure and internationally recognized borders.

It is Guyana's hope that the increasing recognition of the State of Palestine will contribute to a resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the creation of lasting peace and stability in the region.